

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 12 and 20 have been amended. Claims 21-24 are new.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nemoto (USP no. 5,214,622).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, the claims have been amended to more clearly state the invention. More specifically, the claims have been amended to recite that a reminder display time is determined based on the content of the reminder information. No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendment may be found at least one page 9, lines 1-8, which state "[o]nce a reminder entry has been entered by the user, the handheld device determines the appropriate time to transmit a reminder signal for display on the television... The time of the reminder may be obtained from the information entered by the user or determined as a predetermined time prior to the event. The reminder time may be, for example, 0 minutes before the scheduled event where no advance warning is required ... The reminder time may be 5 minutes for a reminder to watch a desired television program. The reminder [time] may be 60 minutes for a reminder for an appointment scheduled remotely from the television ..."

Nemoto discloses an information display apparatus which accumulates arbitrary information inputted to a television receiver from the outside, superimposes the information in a memory on an ordinary video signal and displays the superimposed image on a television display in accordance with a calendar time built in the television receiver. The arbitrary information inputted from the outside can be displayed on a television display at a previously appointed date. (see Abstract). Nemoto further discloses that the displayed message can be displayed for a predetermined time, continuously, intermittently or displayed every time a remote control manipulation is performed. (see col. 5, lines 26-41). However, Nemoto is silent with regard to setting the time that the display is to occur is based on the content of the information to be displayed as is recited in the claims. Rather Nemoto merely discloses that the information is displayed at the time provided by the user.

It is well recognized that to constitute a rejection pursuant to 35 USC §102, i.e., anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art.

Nemoto cannot be said to anticipate the present invention because Nemoto fails to disclose each and every element recited. As shown, Nemoto fails to teach or suggest determining a reminder time based on the content of the reminder information.

At least for this reason, applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1 and 12 have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

With regard to the remaining claims, these claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by, and, hence, allowable over, the reference cited. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

For at least this reason, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claims 4, 11, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nemoto in view of Allen (USP no. 6,2159,891).

Claim 4, 11, 15 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 12, which have been shown to include subject matter not disclosed by Nemoto. Allen is proposed to recite that the subject matter of the reminder message transmitted to and displayed on the television displayed as close caption text.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claim.

Contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, the subject matter recited in claims 4, 11, 15 and 20 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Nemoto and Allen, as Allen fails to correct the deficiency noted in the teaching of Nemoto. Hence, even if there were some motivation to combine the references, as suggested by the Office Action, the combination of Nemoto and Allen fails to recite all the elements recited in independent claims 1 and 12 and, consequently, the aforementioned claims 4, 11, 51 and 20.

For at least this reason, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 21-24 are new. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 9, lines 9-12, which state "... the reminder may be set so that it repeats periodically for a limited time, such as 5 minutes after an initial startup time up to the time of the event, or periodically for an unlimited time, such as once every three hours or once a day."


For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

A check for \$200.00 is enclosed to cover four newly added dependent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Waxler
Registration No. 48,027

Date: June 22, 2006



By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on June 22, 2006.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)


(Signature and Date)